

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 7-10 are all the claims pending in the application.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 9, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waseda et al. (JP 2001-54151 A; hereinafter “Waseda”) in view of Ranalli et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0076933; hereinafter “Ranalli”). Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waseda in view of Ranalli, in further view of Keenan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,577,631 B1; hereinafter “Keenan”).

Claim 1 recites an adaptor being connectable to a mobile phone unit, comprising, *inter alia*, a VoIP (Voice over IP) extension section converting an input telephone number into a telephone number of a private IP telephone corresponding to the input telephone number when the input telephone number is input into the mobile phone unit and calling the telephone number of a private IP telephone, and means for linking a telephone directory of the mobile phone unit and a telephone directory of the IP-PBX.

Paragraph 12 of the translation of Waseda recites, “the portable telephone contact 20 can perform dispatch from the telephone T1 held in the yard electronic automatic exchange through a portable telephone 30, or can make the arrival to a portable telephone 30 receive a message to the telephone T1 held in the yard electronic automatic exchange through this portable telephone 30”. According to the translation, Waseda discloses “dispatching” and “receiving” messages with the telephone T1 through portable telephone 30. That is to say, portable telephone 30 acts as a sort of

relay between telephone T1 and a destination telephone. In contrast, claim 1 recites an input telephone number being input to the mobile phone unit itself and calling the telephone number of a private IP telephone.

The Examiner acknowledges that Waseda fails to teach or suggest the claimed VoIP extension section or means for linking a telephone directory of the mobile phone unit and a telephone directory of the IP-PBX. Instead the Examiner relies on Ranalli to address these deficiencies of Waseda. Specifically, the Examiner asserts, with respect to Ranalli, that “the DS links a standard mobile end user to an IP-PBX by storing the phone numbers or identifiers of the mobile end user and the IP-PBX (paragraph 0039) as if a VoIP extension section; and the DS links a standard mobile end user to an IP-PBX by storing the phone numbers or identifiers of the mobile end user and the IP-PBX,” (Office Action, page 3). The Examiner further asserts that “in order to recognize both the mobile and the IP-PBX number or identifier, their respective directories (or calling lists) are required to be registered into the DS database, therefore, such function reads on as linking a telephone directory of the mobile phone unit and a telephone directory of the IP-PBX,” (Office Action, page 3).

The Examiner appears to be asserting that the “mobile end user” corresponds to the claimed mobile phone unit, and that the “IP-PBX” of Ranalli corresponds to the claimed VoIP extension section.

Firstly, the Examiner appears to be referring to “END_USER 1” or “END_USER 2” illustrated in FIG. 1 of Ranalli as “mobile end user”. However, Ranalli does not teach or even

remotely suggest that the “END_USER 1” or “END_USER 2” is “mobile” as the Examiner erroneously asserts. Ranalli merely discloses “a first communication system (CS-1) 2 serving a first end user (EU-1) 1 providing a telephone number of a second user (EU-2) 3 to a directory service (DS) 12 accessible via Internet 10,” (paragraph 11).

Secondly, the “END_USER 1” and “END_USER 2” are actual users of the communication system of Ranalli. That is, for example, “User A [i.e. “END_USER 1”], connected to an IP-PBX phone system [i.e. communication system (CS-1) 2], dials a telephone number for a destination party located outside of User A’s IP-PBX phone system,” (paragraph 134). While Ranalli discloses that a user may be listed or registered in the directory service (paragraph 16), clearly, an END_USER 1 or END_USER 2 cannot have “respective directories (or calling lists)” as asserted by the Examiner, and therefore such a non existent directory cannot be linked.

Thirdly, the claimed invention recites the “VoIP (Voice over IP) extension section converting an input telephone number into a telephone number of a private IP telephone being corresponding to the input telephone number when **the input telephone number is inputted into the mobile phone unit,**” (emphasis added). According to the Examiner, the IP-PBX (i.e. communication system CS-1) of Ranalli corresponds to the claimed VoIP extension section. According to Ranalli, a user dials a destination telephone number directly to the IP-PBX, via for example, a “TELEPHONE-TYPE KEY PAD 5” (FIG. 1). Ranalli fails to teach or suggest

inputting a telephone number into a mobile phone unit, the input telephone number then being converted by a VoIP extension section.

Thus, Ranalli fails to address the above-mentioned deficiencies of Waseda. Neither Waseda nor Ranalli, independently or in combination, teach or suggest all the claimed features recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the applied references. Claim 2 recites one or more features analogous to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2 is patentable over the applied references at least for reasons analogous to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicant further submits that claims 2-4 and 7-10 are patentable at least by virtue of dependence on claims 1 or 2.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/716,464

Attorney Docket No.: Q78503

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Rohit K. Krishna /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Rohit K. Krishna
Registration No. 62,474

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 13, 2008